HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE CHHATTISGARH : BILASPUR

Single Bench : Hon'ble Shri S.R. Nayak, C.J.

Writ Petition No.5917 OF 2005

PETITIONERS

1. Geetanjali Sahu, D/o Shri L.R. Sahu, Aged about 21 years,
2. Sweta Bhakru, D/o Shri Arjun Bhakru, aged about 22 years
3. Vandna Dewangan, D/o Shri Jayant Kumar Dewangan, aged about 23 years
4. Priya Sahu, D/o Shri N.K. Sahu, aged about 20 years
5. Rachna Daddha, D/o Shri Vijay Daddha, aged about 20 years
6. Vibha Arjaria, D/o Shri D. Arjaria, Aged about 20 years

All are students of Second Year (4th Semester), M.B.B.S. Course, Chhattisgarh Institute of Medical Science, Bilaspur, Distt. Bilaspur (CG)

versus

RESPONDENTS

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through the Secretary, Department of Health, Mantralaya, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)
2. Chhattisgarh Institute of Medical Science through : Dean, Chhattisgarh Institute of Medical Science, Bilaspur, Distt. Bilaspur (C.G.)
3. Guru Ghasidas University through Registrar, Guru Ghasidas University, Koni, Bilaspur, Distt. Bilaspur (CG)

Writ Petition No.317 OF 2006

PETITIONER

Madhukar Baghel, aged about 23 years, son of Shri Fekuram Baghel, resident of village Chataud, Post Dhondhetala, District Raipur (C.G.)

versus

RESPONDENTS

1. The State of Chhattisgarh, through the Secretary, Department of Health and Family Welfare (including Medical Education) D.K.S. Bhawan, Mantralaya, Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
2. The Secretary, Department of Higher Education, D.K.S. Bhawan, Mantralay, Raipur (C.G)
3. Guru Ghasidas University, Bilaspur, through the Chancellor / The Governor Chhattisgarh, Raj Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)

4. The Director, Medical Education State of Chhattisgarh, Raipur (C.G.)
5. The Medical Council of India, Evan a Galib Marg, New Delhi through its Registrar / Authorised Signatory, New Delhi.

Present : Mr.V.R. Tiwari, learned counsel for the petitioners (W.P. No. 5917 of 2005).
Mr. S.K. Chandel, learned counsel for the petitioner (W.P. No. 317 of 2006)
Mr.Yashwant Singh, learned Government Advocate for respondent State of Chhattisgarh.
Mr.Manindra Shrivastava, learned Sr. Advocate with Mr. Amrito Das, learned counsel for CIMS and University.
Miss Samta Jain, learned counsel for MCI.

ORAL ORDER
(Passed on 28th February, 2006)

Since the points involved in these writ petitions are substantially similar, they were clubbed, heard them together and they are being disposed of by this common order.

(2) The points that arise for decision-making in these writ petitions, it is stated at the Bar, are seized by the Apex Court in Writ Petition No. 6314 of 2005 and connected writ petitions filed under Article 32 of the Constitution. In that view of the matter, I dispose of all these writ petitions, leaving open all the contentions raised by the parties in these writ petitions in their respective pleadings. No costs.

(3) Having considered the request of the learned counsel for the petitioners for extension of stay as well as the opposition raised by the University, I think it just and reasonable to continue the stay for a further period of one month from today. Accordingly, I direct that interim order, wherever granted in this batch of writ petitions, shall be in operation for a further period of one month only from today.

Sd/-
Chief Justice

Brajesh